



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.      | FILING DATE       | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|
| 08/798,227           | 02/11/1997        | BRENT KEETH          | 660073.587               | 2230            |
| 27076                | 7590 08/20/2004   |                      | EXAMINER                 |                 |
| DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP |                   |                      | PEIKARI, BEHZAD          |                 |
| INTELLECTU           | JAL PROPERTY DEPA | ARTMENT              |                          |                 |
| SUITE 3400           |                   |                      | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER    |
| 1420 FIFTH AVENUE    |                   |                      | 2186                     |                 |
| SEATTLE, WA 98101    |                   |                      | DATE MAII ED: 08/20/2004 |                 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application N  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 08/798,227   | KEETH, BRENT   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   | B. James Peikari   | 2186   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which  | ation. A proper reply to a   |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. $\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \ $   | ecause:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a)   they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s  | see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) 🔯 they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceli   | ng a corresponding number of fi  | nally rejected claims.   |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. $\square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | ion(s):  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed amendment  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were newly  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | Bili   |  |  |  |  |
| Best Availab  | le Copy  | B. James Peikari<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 2186   |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: after further consideration of the claims following the telephone interview of May 26, 2004, and further in view of the written remarks included with the response filed on June 4, 2004, in which applicant states that the cited references "did not disclose controlling the timing at which a signal transmitted from one device was received at a different device", the examiner believes that this and all other features of the claims are taught by the cited references.

The examiner sincerely regrets any inconvenience that may have been caused by the lack of a second phone call on May 26, 2004, as discussed in the remarks, or even shortly thereafter -- the paper application was being scanned into electronic form during the intervening period.

With regard to the cited prior art, it is clear that the only purpose for providing a feedback and "continuous compensation" is to controllable change the timing at which a signal, i.e. the delayed clock signal, is output, which in turn will change the output timing of the signal from the memory device. It is understood that changing the time at which a signal is output will automatically change the time at which the signal is received at another device.

If applicant has any questions or wishes to discuss these matters further, applicant is invited to contact the examiner again for another telephone interview.